

### REMARKS

The above amendments are presented in order to place the application in better condition for examination.

Much of the examiner's explanation in support of the rejections contained in the Office action mailed September 14, 2011 is worded as if presented in support of the claims as originally filed. For example, the explanation refers to "the tank ... being manufactured from aluminium or the like material" (cf. claim 14, lines 4-5 of the preliminary amendment filed on September 7, 2006) and to "prefabricated structure elements of few different types" (cf. claim 14, lines 5-6). This wording has not appeared in the claims since applicant's reply to the first Office action. Applicant respectfully requests that if the examiner is disposed to reject the claims now presented, she should focus her arguments and explanations in support of the rejections on the current wording of the claims. A rejection cannot be properly stated if it does not address the limitations of the claims as currently expressed.

Respectfully submitted,

/John Smith-Hill/

John Smith-Hill  
Reg. No. 27,730

Chemoff, Vilhauer, McClung & Stenzel, LLP  
601 SW Second Ave. Ste. 1600  
Portland, OR 97204  
Tel. (503) 278-3334  
Fax (503) 228-4373

Docket: AWEK.3511